Three Semantics for Modular Systems

Shahab Tasharrofi and Eugenia Ternovska
Simon Fraser University, email: {ter, sta44}@cs.sfu.ca

arXiv:1405.1229v1 [cs.LO] 6 May 2014

Abstract

In this paper, we further develop the framework of Modular Systems that lays model-theoretic foundations for combining different declarative languages, agents and solvers. We introduce a multi-language logic of modular systems. We define two novel semantics, a structural operational semantics, and an inference-based semantics. We prove the new semantics are equivalent to the original model-theoretic semantics and describe future research directions.

Introduction

Modular Systems (MS) (Tasharrofi and Ternovska 2011) is a language-independent formalism representing and solving complex problems specified declaratively. There are several motivations for introducing the MS formalism:

- the need to be able to split a large problem into subproblems, and to use the most suitable formalism for each part,
- the need to model distributed combinations of programs, knowledge bases, languages, agents, etc.,
- the need to model collaborative solving of complex tasks, such as in satisfiability-based solvers.

The MS formalism gave a unifying view, through a semantic approach, to formal and declarative modelling of modular systems. In that initial work, individual modules were considered from both model-theoretic and operational view. Under the model-theoretic view, a module is a set (or class) of structures, and under the operational view it is an operator, mapping a subset of the vocabulary to another subset. An abstract algebra on modules was given. It is similar to Codd's relational algebra and allows one to combine modules on abstract model-theoretic level, independently from what languages are used for describing them. An important operation in the algebra is the loop (or feedback) operation, since iteration underlies many solving methods. We showed that the power of the loop operator is such that the combined modular system can capture all of the complexity class NP even when each module is deterministic and polytime. Moreover, in general, adding loops gives a jump in the polynomial time hierarchy, one step from the highest complexity of the components. It is also shown that each module can be viewed as an operator, and when each module is (anti-) monotone, the number of the potential solutions can be reduced by using ideas from the logic programming community.

Inspired by practical combined solvers, the authors of (Tasharrofi, Wu, and Ternovska 2011; Tasharrofi, Wu, and Ternovska 2012) introduced an algorithm to solve model expansion tasks for modular systems. The evolution processes of different modules are jointly considered. The algorithm incrementally constructs structures for the expanded vocabulary by communicating with oracles associated with each module, who provide additional information in the form of reasons and advice to navigate the search. It was shown that the algorithm closely corresponds to what is done in practice in different areas such as Satisfiability Modulo Theories (SMT), Integer Linear Programming (ILP), Answer Set Programming (ASP).

Background: Model Expansion In (Mitchell and Ternovska 2005), the authors formalize combinatorial search problems as the task of *model expansion (MX)*, the logical task of expanding a given (mathematical) structure with new relations. Formally, the user axiomatizes the problem in some logic $\mathcal{L}$. This axiomatization relates an instance of the problem (a *finite structure*, i.e., a universe together with some relations and functions), and its solutions (certain *expansions* of that structure with new relations or functions). Logic $\mathcal{L}$ corresponds to a specification/modelling language. It could be an extension of first-order logic such as FO(ID), or an ASP language, or a modelling language from the CP community such as ESSENCE (Frisch et al. 2008). The MX framework was later extended to infinite structures to formalise built-in arithmetic in specification languages (Ternovska and Mitchell 2009; Tasharrofi and Ternovska 2010a).

Recall that a vocabulary is a set of non-logical (predicate and function) symbols. An interpretation for a vocabulary is provided by a *structure*, which consists of a set, called the domain or universe and denoted by $dom(.)$, together with a collection of relations and (total) functions over the universe. A structure can be viewed as an *assignment* to the elements of the vocabulary. An expansion of a structure $\mathcal{A}$ is a structure $\mathcal{B}$ with the same universe, and which has all the relations and functions of $\mathcal{A}$, plus some additional relations or functions.

Formally, the task of model expansion for an arbitrary logic $\mathcal{L}$ is: Given an $\mathcal{L}$-formula ϕ with vocabulary $\sigma \cup \varepsilon$ and a structure $\mathcal{A}$ for σ find an expansion of $\mathcal{A}$, to $\sigma \cup \varepsilon$, that satisfies ϕ. Thus, we expand the structure $\mathcal{A}$ with rela-

tions and functions to interpret ε, obtaining a model $\mathcal{B}$ of ϕ. We call σ, the vocabulary of $\mathcal{A}$, the *instance* vocabulary, and $\varepsilon := vocab(\phi) \setminus \sigma$ the *expansion* vocabulary[1]. If $\sigma = \emptyset$, we talk about *model generation*, a particular type of model expansion that is often studied.

Given a specification, we can talk about a set of $\sigma \cup \varepsilon$-structures which satisfy the specification. Alternatively, we can simply talk about a given set of $\sigma \cup \varepsilon$-structures as an MX-task, without mentioning a particular specification the structures satisfy. These sets of structures will be called *modules* later in the paper. This abstract view makes our study of modularity language-independent.

Example 1 *The following logic program ϕ constitutes an MX specification for Graph 3-colouring:*

$$\begin{array}{c} 1\{R(x), B(x), G(x)\}1 \leftarrow V(x). \\ \bot \leftarrow R(x), R(y), E(x,y). \\ \bot \leftarrow B(x), B(y), E(x,y). \\ \bot \leftarrow G(x), G(y), E(x,y). \end{array}$$

An instance is a structure for vocabulary $\sigma = \{E\}$, i.e., a graph $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{G} = (V; E)$. The task is to find an interpretation for the symbols of the expansion vocabulary $\varepsilon = \{R, B, G\}$ such that the expansion of $\mathcal{A}$ with these is a model of ϕ:

$$\underbrace{(\overbrace{V; E}^{\mathcal{A}},\ R^{\mathcal{B}}, B^{\mathcal{B}}, G^{\mathcal{B}})}_{\mathcal{B}} \models \phi.$$

The interpretations of ε, for structures $\mathcal{B}$ that satisfy ϕ, are exactly the proper 3-colourings of $\mathcal{G}$.

The model expansion task is very common in declarative programming, – given an input, we want to generate a solution to a problem specified declaratively. This is usually done through grounding, i.e., combining instance structure $\mathcal{A}$ to a problem description ϕ thus obtaining a reduction to a low-level solver language such as SAT, ASP, SMT, etc. Model Expansion framework was introduced for systematic study of declarative languages. In particular, it connects KR with descriptive complexity (Immerman 1982). It focuses on problems, not on problem instances, it *separates instances from problem descriptions*. Using the MX framework, one can produce expressiveness and capturing results for specification languages to guarantee:

- universality of a language for a class of problems,
- feasibility of a language by bounding resources needed to solve problems in that language.

In terms of complexity, MX lies in-between model checking (MC) (a full structure is given) and satisfiability (SAT) (we are looking for a structure). Model generation ($\sigma = \emptyset$) has the same complexity as MX. The authors of (Kolokolova et al. 2010) studied the complexity of the three tasks, MC, MX and SAT, for several logics. Despite the importance of MX task in several research areas, the task has not yet been studied sufficiently, unlike the two related tasks of MC and SAT.

[1]By ":=" we mean "is by definition" or "denotes". By $vocab(\phi)$ we understand the vocabulary of ϕ.



Figure 1: Modular representation of a factory

General Research Goal: Adding Modularity Given the importance of combining different languages and solvers to achieve ease of axiomatization and the best performance, our goal is to *extend the MX framework to combine modules specified in different languages.* The following example illustrates what we are aiming for.

Example 2 (Factory as Model Expansion) *In Figure 1, a part of a simple factory is represented as a modular system. Both the office and the workshop modules can be viewed as model expansion tasks. The instance vocabulary of the workshop is $\sigma = \{RawMaterials\}$ and expansion vocabulary $\varepsilon = \{R\}$. The bigger box with dashed borders is an MX task with instance vocabulary $\sigma' = \{Orders, RawMaterials\}$ and expansion vocabulary $\varepsilon' = \{Plan\}$ (the "internal" expansion symbols O and R are hidden from the outside). This task is a compound MX task whose result depends on the internal work of the office and the workshop, both of which can also have an internal structure and be represented as modular systems themselves.*

Contributions of this paper In this paper, we further develop the framework of Modular Systems. In this framework, primitive modules represent individual knowledge bases, agents, companies, etc. They can be axiomatized in a logic, be legacy systems, or be represented by a human who makes decisions. Unlike the previous work, we precisely define the notion of a well-formed modular system, and clearly separate the syntax of the algebraic language and the semantics of the algebra of modular systems. The syntax of the algebra uses a few operations, each of them (except feedback) is a counterpart of an operation in Codd's relational algebra, but over sets of structures rather than tables, and with directionality taken into account. The semantics of both primitive and compound modules is simply a set (class) of structures (an MX task). By relying on the semantics of the algebra, we then introduce its natural counterpart in logic. The logic for modular systems allows for multiple logics axiomatizing individual modules in the same formula. We expect that multi-language formalisms such as ID-logic (Denecker and Ternovska 2008) will be shown to be particular instances of this logic, and other combinations of languages will be similarly developed.

After giving the model-theoretic semantics of the algebra of modular systems, we define what it means, for a primitive module, to act as a non-deterministic operator on states of

the world represented by structures over a large vocabulary. For each expansion, there is a transition to a new structure where the interpretation of the expansion changes, and everything else moves to a new state by inertia. This definition is new and is more general than the one we introduced in the previous work. We then define the semantics of the algebraic operators by Plotkin-style structural operational semantics (Plotkin 1981). This definition also new. We then prove the equivalence of the two semantics, operational and model-theoretic. To illustrate the power of the projection operation, we show how a deterministic polytime program can be "converted" to a non-deterministic one that solves an NP-complete problem. In general, adding projection produces a jump in the computational complexity of the framework, similarly to feedback and union.

The authors of (Lierler and Truszczynski 2014) recently introduced an abstract modular inference systems formalism, and shown how propagations in solvers can be analyzed using abstract inference rules they introduced. We believe it is an important work. In this paper, we show how inference system can be lifted and integrated with our Modular Systems framework. The advantage of this integrations is that, with the help of the inference semantics, we can now go into much greater level of details of propagation processes in our abstract algorithm for solving modular systems. The inference semantics is the third semantics of modular systems mentioned in the title.

The importance of abstract study of modularity We now would like to discuss the potential implications of abstract study of modularity for KR and declarative programming.

A family of multi-language KR formalisms The Modular Systems framework gives rise to a whole new family of KR formalisms by giving the semantics to the combination of modules. This is can be viewed, for example, as a significant extension of answer set programming (ASP). In the past, combining ASP programs that were created separately from each other was only possible, under some conditions, in sequence. Now, we can combine them in a loop, use projections to hide parts of the vocabularies, etc. The previous results remain applicable. We expect, for example, that splittable programs under stable model semantics and stratifiable programs satisfy our conditions for sequential compositions of modules. Previously, in ASP, all modules had to be interpreted under one semantics (e.g. stable model semantics). Now, any model-theoretic semantics of individual modules is allowed. For example, some of the modules can be axiomatized, say, in first-order logic. That is, in particular, our proposal amounts to a "modular multi-language ASP".

Foundations in model theory We believe that classic model theory is the right abstraction tool and a good common ground for combining formalisms developed in different communities. It is sufficiently general and provides a rich machinery developed by generations of researchers. The machinery includes, for example, deep connections between expressiveness and computational complexity. In addition, the notion of a structure is important in KR as it abstractly represents our understanding of the world.

We believe that, despite common goals, the interaction between the CP community and various solver communities on one hand and the KR community is insufficient, and that foundations in model theory can make the interaction much more easy and fruitful.

Analyzing other KR systems Just as in the case of single-module system where we can use the purely semantical framework of model expansion, we can use the framework of Modular Systems to analyze multi-language KR formalisms and to study the expressive power of modular systems.

The modular framework generalizes naturally to the case where we need to study languages (logics) with "built-in" operations. In that case, embedded model expansion has to be considered, where the embedding is into an infinite structure interpreting, e.g., built-in arithmetical operations (Ternovska and Mitchell 2009; Tasharrofi and Ternovska 2010a).

Operational View Due to structural operational semantics, a new type of behaviour equivalence (bisimulation) can be defined on complex modules (e.g. represented by ASP programs). The operational view enables us to obtain results about our modular systems such as approximability of a sub-class of modular systems. While this operational view is novel and we have not developed it very much, we believe that this view allows one to apply the extensive research on proving properties of transition systems and the techniques developed in the situation calculus to prove useful facts about transition systems. We can do e.g. verification of correct behaviour, static or dynamic, particularly in the presence of arithmetic. The mathematical abstraction we proposed allows one to approach solving the problem of synthesis of modular systems abstractly, similarly to (Giacomo, Patrizi, and Sardiña 2013) Just as a Golog program can be synthesized from a library of available programs, a modular system can be synthesized from a library of available solutions to MX tasks.

Related Work Our work on modularity was initially inspired by (Järvisalo et al. 2009) who developed a constraint-based modularity formalism, where modules were represented by constraints and combined through operations of sequential composition and projection. A detailed comparison with that work is given in (Tasharrofi and Ternovska 2011).

The connections with the related formalism of Multi-Context Systems (MCSs), see (Brewka and Eiter 2007) and consequent papers, has been formally studied in (Tasharrofi 2013) and (Tasharrofi and Ternovska 2014). We only mention here that while the contexts are very general, and may have any semantics, not necessarily model-theoretic, the communication between knowledge bases happens through rules of a specific kind, that are essentially rules of logic programs with negation as failure. We, on the other hand, have chosen to represent communication simply through equality of vocabulary symbols, and to develop a model-theoretic algebra of modular systems.

Splitting results in logic programming (ASP) give conditions for separating a program into modules (Turner 1996;

Turner 1996). The results rely on a specific semantics, but can be used for separating programs into modules to represent in our formalism. The same applies to modularity of inductive definitions (Denecker and Ternovska 2008; Vennekens, Gilis, and Denecker 2006; Denecker and Ternovska 2004).

The Generate-Define-Test parts of Answer Set Programs, as discussed in (Denecker et al. 2012), are naturally representable as a sequential composition of the corresponding modules.

A recent work is (Lierler and Truszczynski 2014), where the authors introduce an abstract approach to modular inference systems and solvers was already mentioned, and is used in this paper.

The Algebra of Modular Systems

Each modular system abstractly represents an MX task, i.e., a set (or class) of structures over some instance (input) and expansion (output) vocabulary. Intuitively, a modular system is described as a set of primitive modules (individual MX tasks) combined using the operations of:

1. Projection($\pi_\nu(M)$) which restricts the vocabulary of a module. Intuitively, the projection operator on M defines a modular system that acts as M internally but where some vocabulary symbols are hidden from the outside.
2. Composition($M_1 \rhd M_2$) which connects outputs of M_1 to inputs of M_2. As its name suggests, the composition operator is intended to take two modular systems and defines a multi-step operation by serially composing M_1 and M_2.
3. Union($M_1 \cup M_2$) which, intuitively, models the case when we have two alternatives to do a task (that we can choose from).
4. Feedback($M[R = S]$) which connects output S of M to its inputs R. As the name suggests, the feedback operator models systems with feedbacks or loops. Intuitively, feedbacks represent fixpoints (not necessarily minimal) of modules viewed as operators, since they state that some outputs must be equal to some inputs.
5. Complementation($\overline{M}$) which does "the opposite" of what M does.

These operations are similar to the operations of Codd's relational algebra, but they work on sets of structures instead of relational tables. Thus, our algebra can be viewed as a higher-order counterpart of Codd's algebra, with loops. One can introduce other operations, e.g. as combinations of the ones above. The algebra of modular systems is formally defined recursively starting from primitive modules.

Definition 1 (Primitive Module) *A* primitive module M *is a model expansion task (or, equivalently, a class of structures) with distinct instance (input) vocabulary σ and expansion (output) vocabulary ε.*

A primitive module M can be given, for example, by a decision procedure D_M that decides membership in M. It can also be given by a first- or second-order formula ϕ. In this case, M is all the models of ϕ, $M = Mod(\phi)$. It could also be given by an ASP program. In this case, M would be the stable models of the program, $M = StableMod(\phi)$.

Remark 1 *A module M can be given through axiomatizing it by a formula ϕ in some logic $\mathcal{L}$ such that $vocab(\phi) = \sigma \cup \varepsilon_a \cup \varepsilon$. That is, ϕ may contain auxiliary expansion symbols that are different from the output symbols ε of M. (It may not even be possible to axiomatize M in that particular logic $\mathcal{L}$ without using any auxiliary symbols). In this case, we take $M = Mod(\phi)|_{(\sigma\cup\varepsilon)}$, the models of ϕ restricted to $\sigma \cup \varepsilon$.*

Example 3 *For example, formula ϕ of Example 1 describes the model expansion task for the problem of Graph 3-colouring. Thus, ϕ can be the representation of a module M_{col} with instance vocabulary $\{E\}$ and expansion vocabulary $\{R, G, B\}$.*

Before recursively defining our algebraic language, we have to define composable and independent modules (Järvisalo et al. 2009):

Definition 2 (Composable, Independent) *Modules M_1 and M_2 are* composable *if $\varepsilon_{M_1} \cap \varepsilon_{M_2} = \emptyset$ (no output interference). Module M_2 is* independent *from M_1 if $\sigma_{M_2} \cap \varepsilon_{M_1} = \emptyset$ (no cyclic module dependencies).*

Independence is needed for the definition of union, both properties, comparability and independence are needed for sequential composition, non-empty σ is needed for feedback.

Definition 3 (Well-Formed Modular Systems ($\mathrm{MS}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$)) *The* set of all well-formed modular systems $\mathrm{MS}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$ *for a given input, σ, and output, ε, vocabularies is defined as follows.*

Base Case, Primitive Modules: *If M is a primitive module with instance (input) vocabulary σ and expansion (output) vocabulary ε, then $M \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$.*

Projection *If $M \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$ and $\tau \subseteq \sigma \cup \varepsilon$, then $\pi_\tau(M) \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma \cap \tau, \varepsilon \cap \tau)$.*

Sequential Composition: *If $M \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$, $M' \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma', \varepsilon')$, M is composable (no output interference) with M', and M is independent from M' (no cyclic dependencies) then $(M \rhd M') \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma \cup (\sigma' \setminus \varepsilon), \varepsilon \cup \varepsilon')$.*

Union: *If $M \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$, $M' \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma', \varepsilon')$, M is independent from M', and M' is also independent from M then $(M \cup M') \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma \cup \sigma', \varepsilon \cup \varepsilon')$.*

Feedback: *If $M \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$, $R \in \sigma$, $S \in \varepsilon$, and R and S are symbols of the same type and arity, then $M[R = S] \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma \setminus \{R\}, \varepsilon \cup \{R\})$.*

Complementation: *If $M \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$, then $\overline{M} \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$.*

Nothing else is in the set $\mathrm{MS}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$.

Note that the feedback (loop) operator is not defined for the case $\sigma = \emptyset$. However, composition with a module that selects structures where interpretations of two expansion predicates are equal is always possible. The feedback operator was introduced because loops are important in information propagation, e.g. in all software systems and in solvers (e.g. ILP, ASP-CP, DPLL(T)-based) (Tasharrofi, Wu, and Ternovska 2011; Tasharrofi, Wu, and Ternovska 2012). Feedback operation converts an instance predicate to an expansion predicate, and equates it to another expansion predicate.



Figure 2: A simple modular system where modules are axiomatized in different languages.

Feedbacks are, in a sense, fixpoints, not necessarily minimal[2]. They add expressive power to the algebra of modular systems through introducing additional non-determinism, which is not achieved by equating two expansion predicates. We discuss this issue again after the multi-language logic of modular systems is introduced.

The input-output vocabulary of module M is denoted $vocab(M)$. Modules can have "hidden" vocabulary symbols, see Remark 1.

The description of a modular system (as in Definition 3) gives an algebraic formula representing a system. *Subsystems* of a modular system M are sub-formulas of the formula that represents M. Clearly, each subsystem of a modular system is a modular system itself.

Example 4 (Simple Modular System) *Consider the following axiomatizations of modules[3], each in the corresponding logic $\mathcal{L}_i$.*

$$P_{M_1} := \{\mathcal{L}_{WF} :\ a \leftarrow b\},$$
$$P_{M_2} := \{\mathcal{L}_{WF} :\ a \leftarrow c\},$$
$$P_{M_3} := \{\mathcal{L}_{SM} :\ d \leftarrow not\ a\},$$
$$P_{M_4} := \{\mathcal{L}_P :\ b' \vee c' \equiv \neg\, d\}.$$

$\mathcal{L}_{WF}$ is the logic of logic programs under the well-founded semantics, $\mathcal{L}_{SM}$ is the logic of logic programs under the stable model semantics, $\mathcal{L}_P$ is propositional logic.

The modular system in Figure 2 is represented by the following algebraic specification.

$$M := \pi_{\{a,b,c,d\}}((((M_1 \cup M_2) \rhd M_3) \rhd M_4)[c = c'][b = b']).$$

Module $M' := (((M_1 \cup M_2) \rhd M_3) \rhd M_4)$ has $\sigma_{M'} = \{b, c\}$, $\varepsilon_{M'} = \{a, b', c', d\}$. After adding feedbacks, we have $M'' := M'[c = c'][b = b']$, which turns instance symbols b and c into expansion symbols, so we have $\sigma_{M''} = \emptyset$ and $\varepsilon_{M''} = \{a, b, c, b', c', d\}$, and in addition, the interpretations of c and c', and b and b' must coincide. Finally, projection hides c' and b'.

Module M corresponds to the whole modular system denoted by the box with dotted borders. Its input-output vocabularies are as follows: $\sigma_M = \emptyset$, $\varepsilon_M = \{a, b, c, d\}$, b' and c' are "hidden" from the outside. They are auxiliary expansion symbols, see Remark 1.

Modules $(M_1 \cup M_2)$ and M_3 in this example are composable (no output interference) and independent (no cyclic dependencies), M_1 and M_2 are independent.

The paper (Tasharrofi and Ternovska 2011) contains a more applied example, of a business process planner, where each module represents a business partner.

Multi-Language Logic of Modular Systems It is possible to introduce a multi-language logic of modular systems, where formulas of different languages are combined using conjunctions[4] (standing for $\rhd$), disjunctions ($\cup$), existential second-order quantification (π_ν), etc. For example, model expansion for the following formula

$$\phi_M := \exists b' \exists c' ((((\{\mathcal{L}_{WF} :\ a \leftarrow b\} \vee \{\mathcal{L}_{WF} :\ a \leftarrow c\}) \wedge \{\mathcal{L}_{SM} :\ d \leftarrow not\ a\} \wedge \{\mathcal{L}_P :\ d \leftarrow not\ a\}) \wedge [b = b' \wedge c = c'].$$

with $\sigma_M = \emptyset$ and $\varepsilon = \{a, b, c, d\}$ and "hidden" (auxilliary, see Remark 1) vocabulary $\varepsilon_a = \{b', c'\}$ corresponds to the modular system in Figure 2 from Example 4.

Feedback is a meta-logic operation that does not have a counterpart among logic connectives. Feedback does not exist for model generation ($\sigma = \emptyset$) and increases the number of symbols in the expansion vocabulary. In our example, former instance symbols (b and c in this case) become expansion symbols, and become equal to the outputs b' and c' thus forming loops.

Note also that projections (thus quantifiers) over variables ranging over domain objects can be achieved if such variables are considered to be a part of the vocabularies of modules. In this logic, the full version of ID-logic, for example, would correspond to the case without feedbacks and all modules limited to either those axiomatized in first-order logic or definitions under well-founded semantics. A formal study of such a multi-language logic in connection with existing KR formalisms (such as, e.g. ID-logic, combinations such as ASP and Description logic. etc.) is left as a future research direction.

Note that if all modules are axiomatized in second-order logic, our task is just model expansion for classic second-order logic that is naturally expressible by adding existential second-order quantifiers at the front. If there are multiple languages, we can talk about the *complexity of model expansion for the combined formula (or modular system) as a function of the expressiveness of the individual languages*, which is a study of practical importance.

[2]Modular systems under supported semantics (Tasharrofi 2013) allow one to focus on minimal models.

[3]In realistic examples, module axiomatizations are much more complex and contain multiple rules or axioms.

[4]It will be clear from the semantics that the operation $\rhd$ is commutative.

Model-Theoretic Semantics

So far, we introduced the syntax of the algebraic language using the notion of a well-formed modular system. Those are primitive modules (that are sets of structures) or are constructed inductively by the algebraic operations of composition, union, projection, loop. Model-theoretic semantics associates, with each modular system, a set of structures. Each such structure is called a *model* of that modular system. Let us assume that the domains of all modules are included in a (potentially infinite) universal domain U.

Definition 4 (Models of a Modular System) *Let $M \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$ be a modular system and $\mathcal{B}$ be a $(\sigma \cup \varepsilon)$-structure. We construct the set $M^{mt} = Mod(M)$ of models of module M under model-theoretic semantics recursively, by structural induction on the structure of a module.*

Base Case, Primitive Module: *$\mathcal{B}$ is a model of M if $\mathcal{B} \in M$.*

Projection: *$\mathcal{B}$ is a model of $M := \pi_{(\sigma\cup\varepsilon)}(M')$ (with $M' \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma', \varepsilon')$) if a $(\sigma' \cup \varepsilon')$-structure $\mathcal{B}'$ exists such that $\mathcal{B}'$ is a model of M' and $\mathcal{B}'$ expands $\mathcal{B}$.*

Composition: *$\mathcal{B}$ is a model of $M := M_1 \rhd M_2$ (with $M_1 \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma_1, \varepsilon_1)$ and $M_2 \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma_2, \varepsilon_2)$) if $\mathcal{B}|_{(\sigma_1\cup\varepsilon_1)}$ is a model of M_1 and $\mathcal{B}|_{(\sigma_2\cup\varepsilon_2)}$ is a model of M_2.*

Union: *$\mathcal{B}$ is a model of $M := M_1 \cup M_2$ (with $M_1 \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma_1, \varepsilon_1)$ and $M_2 \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma_2, \varepsilon_2)$) if either $\mathcal{B}|_{(\sigma_1\cup\varepsilon_1)}$ is a model of M_1, or $\mathcal{B}|_{(\sigma_2\cup\varepsilon_2)}$ is a model of M_2.*

Feedback: *$\mathcal{B}$ is a model of $M := M'[R = S]$ (with $M' \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma', \varepsilon')$) if $R^{\mathcal{B}} = S^{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is model of M'.*

Complementation: *$\mathcal{B}$ is a model of $M := \overline{M'}$ (with $M, M' \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$) if and $\mathcal{B}$ is not a model of M'. That is, $\overline{M'}$ denotes the complement of M in the set of all possible $\sigma \cup \varepsilon$-structures over the universal domain U.*

Nothing else is a model of M.

Note that, by this semantics, sequential composition is a commutative operation (we could have used $\bowtie$ notation), however the direction of information propagation is uniquely given by the separations of the input and output vocabularies. Notice that it's not possible to compose two modules in two different ways. If it was possible, then in the compound module we would had that the intersection of the input and the output vocabularies would not be empty, and this is not allowed. So, we prefer to use $\rhd$ instead of $\bowtie$ for both historic and mnemonic reasons, and encourage the reader to write algebraic formulas in a way that corresponds to their visualizations of the corresponding modular systems.

An example illustrating the semantics of the feedback operator, as well as non-determinism introduced by this operator is given in the appendix.

The task of model expansion for modular system M takes a σ-structure $\mathcal{A}$ and finds (or reports that none exists) a $(\sigma \cup \varepsilon)$-structure $\mathcal{B}$ that expands $\mathcal{A}$ and is a model of M. Such a structure $\mathcal{B}$ is a *solution of M for input $\mathcal{A}$.*

Remark 2 *The semantics does not put any finiteness restriction on the domains of structures. Thus, the framework works for modules with infinite structures.*

Structural Operational Semantics

In this section, we introduce a novel Structural Operational Semantics of modular systems.

We now focus on potentially infinite all-inclusive vocabulary τ that subsumes the vocabularies of all modules considered. Thus, we always have $vocab(M) \subseteq \tau$.

Definition 5 (State of a Modular Systems) *A τ-state of a modular system $M \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$ is a τ-structure such that $(\sigma \cup \varepsilon) \subseteq \tau$.*

The semantics we give is structural because, for example, the meaning of the sequential composition, $M_1 \rhd M_2$, is defined through the meaning of M_1 and the meaning of M_2.

Definition 6 (Modules as Operators) *We say that a well-formed modular system M (non-deterministically) maps τ-state $\mathcal{B}_1$ to τ-state $\mathcal{B}_2$, notation $(M, \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2$, if we can apply the rules of the structural operational semantics (below) starting from this expression and arriving to $true$. In that case, we say that transition $(M, \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2$ is* derivable. **Primitive modules** *M:*

$$\frac{(M, \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2}{true} \text{ if } \mathcal{B}_2|_{(\sigma\cup\varepsilon)} \in M \text{ and } \mathcal{B}_2|_{(\tau\setminus\varepsilon)} = \mathcal{B}_1|_{(\tau\setminus\varepsilon)}.$$

We proceed by induction on the structure of modular system M. **Projection** *$\pi_\nu(M)$:*

$$\frac{(\pi_\nu(M), \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2}{(M, \mathcal{B}_1') \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2'} \text{ if } \mathcal{B}_1'|_\nu = \mathcal{B}_1|_\nu \text{ and } \mathcal{B}_2'|_\nu = \mathcal{B}_2|_\nu.$$

Composition *$M_1 \rhd M_2$:*

$$\frac{(M_1 \rhd M_2, \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2}{(M_1, \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}' \text{ and } (M_2, \mathcal{B}') \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2}.$$

Union *$M_1 \cup M_2$:*

$$\frac{(M_1 \cup M_2, \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2}{(M_1, \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2}, \qquad \frac{(M_1 \cup M_2, \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2}{(M_2, \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2}.$$

Feedback *$M[R = S]$:*

$$\frac{(M[R = S], \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2}{(M, \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2}, \text{ if } R^{\mathcal{B}_1} = S^{\mathcal{B}_2}.$$

Complementation *$\overline{M}$:*

$$\frac{(\overline{M}, \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2}{true} \text{ if } (M, \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2 \text{ is not derivable.}$$

Nothing else is derivable.

Let us clarify the projection operation $\pi_\nu(M)$. Let $vocab(M) = \sigma' \cup \varepsilon'$, let $\nu = \sigma \cup \varepsilon$, $\sigma \subseteq \sigma'$, $\varepsilon \subseteq \varepsilon'$. Module $\pi_\nu(M)$, viewed as an operator, is applied to τ-structure $\mathcal{B}_1$. It (a) expands σ-part of $\mathcal{B}_1$ to σ' by an arbitrary interpretation over the same domain, and then (b) applies M to the modified input, (c) projects the result of application of M onto ε, ignoring everything else, (d) the interpretations of $\tau \setminus \epsilon$ are moved from $\mathcal{B}_1$ by inertia.

Definition 7 (Operational Semantics) *Let M be a well-formed modular system in $\mathrm{MS}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$. The semantics of M is given by the following set.*

$$M^{op} := \{\mathcal{B} \mid (\mathcal{B}_1, M) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2 \text{ and } \mathcal{B}|_\sigma = \mathcal{B}_1|_\sigma,\ \mathcal{B}|_\varepsilon = \mathcal{B}_2|_\varepsilon\}.$$



Figure 3: An illustration of Definition 7. Module $M \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$ maps a τ-structure $\mathcal{B}_1$ (with $(\sigma \cup \varepsilon) \subseteq \tau$) to a τ-structure $\mathcal{B}_2$ by changing the interpretation ε according to M (so that the σ part and the new ε part, together, form a model of M). Interpretation of all other symbols, including those in σ, stays the same. This is similar to how frame axioms keep fluents that are not affected by actions unchanged in the situation calculus.

Figure 3 illustrates this definition.

Corollary 1 *Every result of application of M is its fixpoint. That is, for any τ-states $\mathcal{B}_1$, $\mathcal{B}_2$, if $(M, \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2$, then $(M, \mathcal{B}_2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2$.*

Proof: By Definition 7, because of inertia, the interpretation of σ is transferred from $\mathcal{B}_1$ to $\mathcal{B}_2$. Since the interpretation of ε is already changed by M, nothing is to be changed, and $(M, \mathcal{B}_2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2$. ∎

Theorem 1 (Operational = Model-theoretic Semantics) *Let M be a well-formed modular system in $\mathrm{MS}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$. Then, its model-theoretic and operational semantics coincide,*

$$M^{mt} = M^{op}.$$

The most important consequence of this theorem is that all the results obtained when modules are viewed as operators, still hold when modules are viewed as sets of structures (and vice versa). Thus, we may use either of these semantics. From now on, by M we mean either one of these sets M^{mt} or M^{op}.

Proof: We prove the statement inductively.

Base case, primitive module By definition, model-theoretically, $\mathcal{B}$ is a model of M if $\mathcal{B} \in M$. On the other hand, operationaly,

$$M^{op} := \{\mathcal{B} \mid (\mathcal{B}_1, M) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2 \text{ and } \mathcal{B}|_\sigma = \mathcal{B}_1|_\sigma,\ \mathcal{B}|_\varepsilon = \mathcal{B}_2|_\varepsilon\},$$

where

$$\frac{(M, \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2}{true} \text{ if } \mathcal{B}_2|_{(\sigma \cup \varepsilon)} \in M \text{ and } \mathcal{B}_2|_{(\tau \setminus \varepsilon)} = \mathcal{B}_1|_{(\tau \setminus \varepsilon)}.$$

Thus, $\mathcal{B} \in M$, and the two semantics coincide for primitive modules.

Our inductive hypothesis is that the statement of the theorem holds for M_1, M_2 and M'. We proceed inductively.

Projection $M := \pi_\nu(M')$. By the hypothesis, $(M')^{mt} = (M')^{op}$, where $(M')^{op}$ is constructed "from pieces", $(M')^{op} := \{\mathcal{B}' \mid (\mathcal{B}'_1, M') \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}'_2 \text{ and } \mathcal{B}|_\sigma = \mathcal{B}'_1|_\sigma,\ \mathcal{B}|_\varepsilon = \mathcal{B}'_2|_\varepsilon\}$. We apply the rule

$$\frac{(\pi_\nu(M'), \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2}{(M', \mathcal{B}'_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}'_2} \text{ if } \mathcal{B}'_1|_\nu = \mathcal{B}_1|_\nu \text{ and } \mathcal{B}'_2|_\nu = \mathcal{B}_2|_\nu$$

and obtain that $(\pi_\nu(M'), \mathcal{B}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2$ where $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ are just like $\mathcal{B}'_1$ and $\mathcal{B}'_2$ on the vocabulary ν. Now, $M := \pi_\nu(M')$ is constructed "from σ and ε pieces" of $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$, respectively (where $\nu = \sigma \cup \varepsilon$):

$$M^{op} := \{\mathcal{B} \mid (\mathcal{B}_1, M) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_2 \text{ and } \mathcal{B}|_\sigma = \mathcal{B}_1|_\sigma,\ \mathcal{B}|_\varepsilon = \mathcal{B}_2|_\varepsilon\},$$

On the other hand, model-theoretically, $\mathcal{B}$ is a model of $M := \pi_{(\sigma \cup \varepsilon)}(M')$ (with $M' \in \mathrm{MS}(\sigma', \varepsilon')$) if a $(\sigma' \cup \varepsilon')$-structure $\mathcal{B}'$ exists such that $\mathcal{B}'$ is a model of M' and $\mathcal{B}'$ expands $\mathcal{B}$, which makes the two semantics equal for projection, $(M)^{mt} = (M)^{op}$.

We omit the proofs for the other inductive cases. ∎

Applications of Operational View We now discuss how the operational semantics can be used. For example, we can consider modular systems at various levels of granularity. We might be interested in the following question: if M gives a transition from a structure $\mathcal{B}$ to structures $\mathcal{B}'$, then what are the transitions given by the subsystems of M? While answering this question in its full generality is algorithmically impossible, we may study the question of whether a particular transition by a subsystem exists. To answer it, one has to start from the system and build down to the subsystem using the rules of the structural operation semantics. Reasoning about subsystems of a modular system can be useful in business process modelling. Suppose a particular transition should hold for the entire process. This might be the global task of an organization. In order to make that transition, the subsystems have to perform their own transitions. Those transitions are derivable using the rules of structural operational semantics.

Complexity In the following proposition, we assume a standard encoding of structures as binary strings) as is common in Descriptive complexity (Immerman 1982). Note that if M is deterministic, it is polytime in the size of the encoding of the input structure. This is because the domain remains the same, the arities of the relations in ε are fixed, so we need (n^k) steps to construct new interpretations of ε, and move the remaining relations.

Proposition 1 *Let M be a module that performs a (deterministic) polytime computation. Projection $\pi_\nu(M)$ increases the complexity of M from P to NP. More generally, for an operator M on the k-th level of the Polynomial Time hierarchy (PH), projection can increase the complexity of M from Δ_k^P to Σ_{k+1}^P.*

Proof: We will show the property for the jump from P to NP, for illustration. The proof generalizes to all levels of PH. Let M takes an instance of an NP-complete problem, such as a graph in 3-Colourability, encoded in σ_G, and what it means to be 3-Colourable, as a formula encoded in the interpretation of σ_ϕ, and returns an instance of SAT encoded in ε, a CNF formula that is satisfiable if and only if the graph is 3-Colourable, and a yes/no answer bit represented by ε_{answer}.

Thus, M performs a deterministic (thus, polytime) reduction. Consider $\pi_\nu(M)$, where $\nu = \sigma_G \cup \varepsilon_{answer}$. This module takes a graph and returns a yes or no answer depending on whether the graph is 3-colourable. Thus, $\pi_\nu(M)$ solves an NP-complete problem. ∎

Union and feedback change the complexity as well.

Inference Semantics of Modular Systems

In modular systems, each agent or a knowledge base can have its own way of reasoning, that can be formulated through inferences or propagations. To define inferential semantics for modular systems, we closely follow (Lierler and Truszczynski 2014). Since input/output is not considered by the authors, their case corresponds to the instance vocabulary being empty, $\sigma = \emptyset$, i.e., model generation, and can be viewed as an analysis of the after-grounding faze. Since we want to separate problem descriptions and their instances (and reuse problem descriptions), as well as to define additional algebraic operations (the authors consider conjunctions only), we need to allow $\sigma \neq \emptyset$, and present inferences on partial structures. This is not hard however.

We start by assuming that there is a constant for every element of the domains. We view structures as sets of ground atoms. We now closely follow and generalize the definitions of (Lierler and Truszczynski 2014) from sets of propositional atoms to first-order structures, to establish a connection to the Modular Systems framework presented above. The propositional case then corresponds to structures over the domain $\{\langle\,\rangle\}$ containing the empty tuple that interprets propositional symbols that are true.

Let a fixed countably infinite set of ground atoms τ be given. We use $Lit(\tau)$ to denote the set of all literals over τ. For $S \subseteq Lit(\tau)$:

$S^+ := \tau \cap S$

$S^- := \{a \in \tau \mid \neg a \in S\}$

$l \in Lit(\tau)$ is unassigned in S if $l \notin M$ and $\bar{l} \notin S$

S is consistent if $S^+ \cap S^- \neq \emptyset$

Let $C(\tau)$ be all consistent subsets of $Lit(\tau)$.

Definition 8 (Abstract Inference Representation of M) *An* abstract inference representation M^i of module M *over a vocabulary τ is a finite set of pairs of the form (S, l), where $S \in C(\tau)$, $l \in Lit(\tau)$, and $l \notin Lit(\tau)$. Such pairs are called* inferences of the module M.

In the exposition below, we view structures as sets of propositional atoms, $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \tau$.

S is consistent with $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \tau$ if $S^+ \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ and $S^- \cap \mathcal{B} = \emptyset$. Literal l is consistent with $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \tau$ if $\{l\}$ is consistent with $\mathcal{B}$.

Definition 9 (Primitive Module, Inferential Semantics) *A primitive module $M \in MS(\sigma, \varepsilon)$ is a set of $(\sigma \cup \varepsilon)$-structures $\mathcal{B}$ such that for every inference $(S, l) \in M^i$ such as S is consistent with $\mathcal{B}$, l is consistent with $\mathcal{B}$, too.*

Thus, primitive modules, even when they are represented through abstract inferences, are sets of structures as before, and the definitions of the algebraic operations do not need to be changed.

The inference framework can be viewed as yet another (very useful) way of representing modules. Since the inference framework is abstract, we cannot prove a correspondence between a given individual module presented as a set of structures or as an operator on one hand and as an inferential representation on the other in general, without specifying what inference mechanism is used. However, we can do it for particular cases such as $Ent(T)$ (Lierler and Truszczynski 2014), which is left for a future paper.

With the inference semantics as described, we can now model problems (sets of instances) rather than single instances as a combination of other problems. This semantics allows one to study the details of propagation of information in the process of constructing solutions to modular systems, through incremental construction of partial structures as in (Tasharrofi, Wu, and Ternovska 2011; Tasharrofi, Wu, and Ternovska 2012), but in more detail. This direction is left for future research.

Conclusion and Future Directions

We described a modular system framework, where primitive and compound modules are sets (classes) of structures, and combinations of modules are achieved by applying algebraic operations that are a higher-order counterpart of Codd's relational algebra operations. An additional operation is the feedback operator that connects output symbols with the input ones and is used to model information propagation such as loops of software systems and solvers.

We defined two novel semantics of modular systems, operational and inferential, that are equivalent to the original model-theoretic semantics (Tasharrofi and Ternovska 2011). We presented a multi-language logic, a syntactic counterpart of the algebra of modular systems. Minimal models of modular systems are introduced in a separate paper on supported modular systems, see also (Tasharrofi 2013).

The framework of modular systems gives us, through its semantic-based approach, a unifying perspective on multi-language formalisms and solvers. More importantly, it gives rise to a whole new family of multi-language KR formalisms, where new formalisms can be obtained by instantiating specific logics defining individual modules.

The framework can be used for analysis of existing KR languages. In particular, expressiveness and complexity results for combined formalisms can be obtained in a way similar to the previous work (Mitchell and Ternovska 2008; Tasharrofi and Ternovska 2010b; Tasharrofi and Ternovska 2010a) where single-module embedded model expansion was used.

References

[Brewka and Eiter 2007] Brewka, G., and Eiter, T. 2007. Equilibria in heterogeneous nonmonotonic multi-context systems. In *Proceedings of the 22nd National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI'07) - Volume 1*, 385–390. AAAI Press.

[Denecker and Ternovska 2004] Denecker, M., and Ternovska, E. 2004. Inductive situation calculus. In *Proc., KR-04*.

[Denecker and Ternovska 2008] Denecker, M., and Ternovska, E. 2008. A logic of non-monotone inductive definitions. *ACM transactions on computational logic (TOCL)* 9(2):1–51.

[Denecker et al. 2012] Denecker, M.; Lierler, Y.; Truszczynski, M.; and Vennekens, J. 2012. A tarskian informal semantics for answer set programming. In Dovier, A., and Costa, V. S., eds., *ICLP (Technical Communications)*, volume 17 of *LIPIcs*, 277–289. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.

[Frisch et al. 2008] Frisch, A. M.; Harvey, W.; Jefferson, C.; Martínez-Hernández, B.; and Miguel, I. 2008. Essence: A constraint language for specifying combinatorial problems. *Constraints* 13:268–306.

[Giacomo, Patrizi, and Sardiña 2013] Giacomo, G. D.; Patrizi, F.; and Sardiña, S. 2013. Automatic behavior composition synthesis. *Artif. Intell.* 196:106–142.

[Immerman 1982] Immerman, N. 1982. Relational queries computable in polynomial time. In *STOC '82: Proceedings of the 14th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 147–152.

[Järvisalo et al. 2009] Järvisalo, M.; Oikarinen, E.; Janhunen, T.; and Niemelä, I. 2009. A module-based framework for multi-language constraint modeling. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Logic Programming and Non-monotonic Reasoning (LPNMR'09)*, volume 5753 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (LNCS)*, 155–168. Springer-Verlag.

[Kolokolova et al. 2010] Kolokolova, A.; Liu, Y.; Mitchell, D.; and Ternovska, E. 2010. On the complexity of model expansion. In *Proc., 17th Int'l Conf. on Logic for Programming, Artificial Intelligence and Reasoning (LPAR-17)*, 447–458. Springer. LNCS 6397.

[Lierler and Truszczynski 2014] Lierler, Y., and Truszczynski, M. 2014. Abstract modular inference systems and solvers. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Symposium on Practical Aspects of Declarative Languages (PADL'14)*.

[Mitchell and Ternovska 2005] Mitchell, D. G., and Ternovska, E. 2005. A framework for representing and solving NP search problems. In *Proc. AAAI*, 430–435.

[Mitchell and Ternovska 2008] Mitchell, D. G., and Ternovska, E. 2008. Expressiveness and abstraction in ESSENCE. *Constraints* 13(2):343–384.

[Plotkin 1981] Plotkin, G. 1981. A structural approach to operational semantics. Technical Report DAIMI FN-19, Computer Science Department, Aarhus University. Also published in: Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming, 60-61:17-140, 2004.

[Tasharrofi and Ternovska 2010a] Tasharrofi, S., and Ternovska, E. 2010a. PBINT, a logic for modelling search problems involving arithmetic. In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference on Logic for Programming, Artificial Intelligence and Reasoning (LPAR'17)*. Springer. LNCS 6397.

[Tasharrofi and Ternovska 2010b] Tasharrofi, S., and Ternovska, E. 2010b. Built-in arithmetic in knowledge representation languages. In *NonMon at 30 (Thirty Years of Nonmonotonic Reasoning)*.

[Tasharrofi and Ternovska 2011] Tasharrofi, S., and Ternovska, E. 2011. A semantic account for modularity in multi-language modelling of search problems. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Frontiers of Combining Systems (FroCoS)*, 259–274.

[Tasharrofi and Ternovska 2014] Tasharrofi, S., and Ternovska, E. 2014. Generalized multi-context systems. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning (KR2014)*.

[Tasharrofi, Wu, and Ternovska 2011] Tasharrofi, S.; Wu, X. N.; and Ternovska, E. 2011. Solving modular model expansion tasks. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Workshop on Logic Programming (WLP'11)*, volume abs/1109.0583. Computing Research Repository (CoRR).

[Tasharrofi, Wu, and Ternovska 2012] Tasharrofi, S.; Wu, X. N.; and Ternovska, E. 2012. Solving modular model expansion: Case studies. In *Postproceedings of the 19th International Conference on Applications of Declarative Programming and Knowledge Management and 25th Workshop on Logic Programming*, 175–187. Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence (LNAI).

[Tasharrofi 2013] Tasharrofi, S. 2013. *Solving Model Expansion Tasks: System Design and Modularity*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada.

[Ternovska and Mitchell 2009] Ternovska, E., and Mitchell, D. G. 2009. Declarative programming of search problems with built-in arithmetic. In *Proc. of IJCAI*, 942–947.

[Turner 1996] Turner, H. 1996. Splitting a default theory. In *Proceedings of the 13th National Conference on Artificial intelligence (AAAI'96) - Volume 1*, 645–651. AAAI Press.

[Vennekens, Gilis, and Denecker 2006] Vennekens, J.; Gilis, D.; and Denecker, M. 2006. Splitting an operator: Algebraic modularity results for logics with fixpoint semantics. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic* 7(4):765–797.

Appendix

Example 5 *We illustrate models of a simple modular system with feedback operator. Consider the following axiomatization P_{M_0} of a primitive module M_0, where $\sigma_{M_0} = \{i\}$ and $\varepsilon_{M_0} = \{a, b\}$.*

$$P_{M_0} := \left\{ \mathcal{L}_{SM} : \begin{array}{l} a \leftarrow i, not\ b, \\ b \leftarrow i, not\ a. \end{array} \right\}$$

We will demonstrate how the set of models of this program changes when we use the feedback operator. When the input i is true (given by the corresponding instance structure), then

$$StableMod(P_{M_0},\ i = true) = \{\{a\}, \{b\}\}.$$

When i is false, there is one model, where everything is false,

$$StableMod(P_{M_0},\ i = false) = \{\emptyset\}.$$

Module M_0 is the set of structures for the entire $\sigma_{M_0} \cup \varepsilon_{M_0}$ vocabulary. Since we are dealing with a propositional case,



Figure 4: Module M_1.

each structure is represented by a set of atoms that are true in that structure.

$$M_0 = \{\{i, a\}, \{i, b\}, \emptyset\}.$$

Now consider a different module, M_1, with $\sigma_{M_1} = \{i, a, b\}$ and $\varepsilon_{M_1} = \{a', b'\}$, axiomatized by

$$P_{M_1} := \left\{ \mathcal{L}_{SM} : \begin{array}{l} a' \leftarrow i, not\ b, \\ b' \leftarrow i, not\ a. \end{array} \right\}$$

This modular system is deterministic, – for each input (each of the eight possible interpretations of i, a and b), there is at most one model.

i	a	b	*Models of* M_1
$\bot$	$\bot$	$\bot$	$\{\emptyset\}$
$\bot$	$\top$	$\bot$	$\{\emptyset\}$
$\bot$	$\bot$	$\top$	$\{\emptyset\}$
$\bot$	$\top$	$\top$	$\{\emptyset\}$
$\top$	$\bot$	$\bot$	$\{\{i, a', b'\}\}$
$\top$	$\top$	$\bot$	$\{\{i, a, a'\}\}$
$\top$	$\bot$	$\top$	$\{\{i, b, b'\}\}$
$\top$	$\top$	$\top$	$\{\{i, a, b\}\}$

Thus, we have:

$$M_1 = \{\emptyset, \{i, a', b'\}, \{i, a, a'\}, \{i, b, b'\}, \{i, a, b\}\}.$$

If we add feedback, we obtain the following system $M_2 = M_1[a = a'][b = b']$. Its input is i, all other symbols are in the expansion vocabulary. The models are:

i	*Models of* M_2
$\bot$	$\{\emptyset\}$
$\bot$	$\{\emptyset\}$
$\top$	$\{\{i, a, a'\}\}$
$\top$	$\{\{i, b, b'\}\}$

$$M_2 = M_1[a = a'][b = b'] = \{\emptyset, \{i, a, a'\}, \{i, b, b'\}\}.$$

As we see here, after adding feedback, for the same input i, we obtain two different models. Thus, by means of feedback, a deterministic system M_1 was turned into a non-deterministic system M_2.

This modular system is deterministic, – for each input (each of the eight possible interpretations of i, a and b), there is at most one model. Notice also that

$$\pi_{\{i,a,b\}}(M_1[a = a'][b = b']) = M_0.$$



Figure 5: Module M_2.